



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,692	11/26/2003	James B. McCormick	46521-56177	8923
21888	7590	11/10/2008		
THOMPSON COBURN, LLP			EXAMINER	
ONE US BANK PLAZA			RAMILLANO, LORE JANET	
SUITE 3500				
ST LOUIS, MO 63101			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
11/10/2008	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

IPDOCKET@THOMPSONCOBURN.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/723,692	Applicant(s) MCCORMICK, JAMES B.
	Examiner LORE RAMILLANO	Art Unit 1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/29/08.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11/26/03 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. .
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1448)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/16/08 and 9/9/08

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date .
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. In applicant's reply filed on 7/29/08, applicant amended claim 1. Claims 1-7 are pending and are under examination.

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is withdrawn.

Prior art rejections

3. The rejections over the prior art are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. **Claims 1-2 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hartl ("Hartl," US 4225557) in light of Roe et al. ("Roe," US 6060039).**

In figures 1-3, Hartl discloses a foldable liquid permeable sheet (i.e. cardboard) having edges; a liquid permeable target (i.e. 13) disposed on the foldable liquid permeable sheet within the edges of the sheet, thereby providing extended flap portions which flap portions are foldable to overlap the liquid permeable target; and a malleable securing strip (i.e. 18) attached to the foldable liquid permeable sheet of a length

sufficient to secure the folded flap portions overlapping the liquid permeable target (i.e. column 3, lines 30-47).

Hartl further discloses, in figures 1-3, the following: that the malleable securing strip is attached at an edge of the liquid permeable sheet; the liquid permeable target is coated with a release agent (i.e. col. 3, lined 46- 47); the permeable target is a permeable paper sheet (i.e. col. 3, lines 46-47).

Roe discloses a floor (11) of a container (10) in fig. 7B, that may be made of a material that is permeable to water, such as cardboard, nitrocellulose or paper in, i.e. col. 11, line 63 to col. 12, line 2. Hartl's cardboard sheet is inherently liquid permeable because Roe discloses that cardboard is a material that is permeable to water.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
7. **Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartl, in light of Roe, and in view of Rochette (US 3537636).**

The disclosure of Hartl, in light of Roe, is stated above. Hartl, in light of Roe, does not specifically disclose having a malleable securing strip comprising a metal wire or a metal foil.

In figures 1-4, Rochette discloses an invention consisting of a reclosable bag formed from a sheet of flexible material. The bag further comprises a bendable metal wire and a pair of flexible coverings strips (i.e. metal foil), which are sealed together and the wire is sandwiched between so that the wire is embedded between the strips (i.e.

column 2, line 70 to column 3, line 8). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the malleable securing strip of Hartl, in light of Roe, with a metal wire and/or with a metal foil because it would be beneficial to have a sealing means that provides reinforcement.

8. **Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartl, in light of Roe.

The disclosure of Hartl, in light of Roe, is indicated above. While Hartl, in light of Roe, discloses having an X and Y coordinate marking lines on the liquid permeable target in fig. 1 for explanatory purposes, Hartl, in light of Roe, does not specifically disclose having such marking lines physically on the liquid permeable target. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Hartl, in light of Roe, by physically having the X and Y coordinate marking lines on the liquid permeable target because it would allow the user to quickly determine whether the sample is placed on the portions of the target that has the greatest color intensity to insure a correct diagnosis is made.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 7/29/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

35 USC 102(b) rejection by Hartl

In response to applicant's argument that Hartl teaches away from Applicant's invention, as claimed, and would also destroy Applicant's Invention, as claimed, for its stated purpose of providing a foldable liquid permeable sheet having extended flap

portions which flap portions are foldable to overlap the liquid permeable target, where the liquid is histological examination liquid, examiner respectfully does not find this argument to be persuasive. Arguments that the alleged anticipatory prior art is nonanalogous art' or teaches away from the invention' or is not recognized as solving the problem solved by the claimed invention, are not germane' to a rejection under section 102. Furthermore, the argument of destroying the Applicant's invention is also not germane to a rejection under section 102 (see MPEP 2143.01). Here, the basis of the Hartl rejection, with regard to claims 1-2 and 5-6, is under 35 USC 102(b).

In response to applicant's argument that "cardboard" is not inherently permeable, examiner disagrees. Note that as long as there is evidence of record establishing inherency, failure of those skilled in the art to contemporaneously recognize an inherent property, function or ingredient of a prior art reference does not preclude a finding of anticipation. Therefore, Roe properly shows an inherent characteristic of Hartl's liquid permeable cardboard.

Furthermore, the "intended use" of the structural limitations recited in the pending claims is not sufficient to overcome the prior art rejection since Hartl's invention discloses the structural limitations recited in the pending claims.

In response to applicant's argument that Hartl does not disclose a malleable securing strip but rather a slit, examiner respectfully disagrees. A claim must be interpreted in light of the specification without reading limitations into the claim. In applicant's original disclosure, the claim language, "malleable securing strip," does not appear to be limited by a definition in the original disclosure since the original disclosure

does not appear to clearly set forth the definition of such language explicitly and with reasonable clarity, deliberateness, and precision. Here, Hartl's strip (i.e. 18, fig. 1) is inherently malleable since it can bend to allow the tabs to be inserted into the strip. Also, Hartl's strip is inherently a securing strip because it fastens the tab to the sheet.

In response to applicant's argument that the slits (18 and 18') disclosed by Hartl are not located at the edge of sheet, examiner respectfully disagrees. Based on the drawings disclosed by Hartl (i.e. figs. 1-2), it appears that the slits are located at the edge of the sheet.

In response to applicant's argument that Hartl's reagent is different from applicant's recited, "release agent," examiner does not find this argument to be convincing. A claim must be interpreted in light of the specification without reading limitations into the claim. In applicant's original disclosure, the claim language, "release agent," does not appear to be limited by a definition in the original disclosure since the original disclosure does not appear to clearly set forth the definition of such language explicitly and with reasonable clarity, deliberateness, and precision. Therefore, it appears that Hartl's reagent properly reads on applicant's "release agent."

35 USC 103(a) rejection over Hartl, in light of Roe, and in view of Rochette

In response to applicant's argument that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention, examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the

claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, examiner has properly shown that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the prior art references because it would be beneficial to have a sealing means with a metal wire and/or with a metal foil to provide reinforcement.

In response to applicant's argument that the X and Y coordinate markings are wholly absent from both Hartl and Roe, examiner respectfully does not find this argument to be convincing. Examiner has provided the required motivation, in the previous Office action (filed 5/1/08), to combine the references by indicating that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Hartl, in light of Roe, by physically having the X and Y coordinate marking lines on the liquid permeable target because it would be allow the user to quickly determine whether the sample is placed on the portions of the target that has the greatest color intensity to insure a correct diagnosis is made. The motivation to combine the prior art references is proper, especially, since Hartl, in light of Roe, discloses having X and Y coordinate marking lines on the liquid permeable target in fig. 1 for explanatory purposes.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LORE RAMILLANO whose telephone number is (571)272-7420. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. to Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jill Warden/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797

Lore Ramillano
Examiner
Art Unit 1797